

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/785,075	NISHIWAKI, NOBUYUKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marc E. Norman	3744	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc E. Norman. (3)_____

(2) James Golladay. (4)_____

Date of Interview: _____

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Oka et al. and Naitoh.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**MARC NORMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative presented arguments regarding weaknesses in the rejection of claims 1 and 11 set forth in the final rejection of the previous examiner, particularly relating to the feature of driving an electric fan when the detected cooling water temperature is within a predetermined range and the abnormal state detecting is commenced on the basis of the detected cooling water temperature and the predicted cooling water temperature. The Examiner agreed that the combined references did not appear to teach this feature. However, the Examiner noted that, particularly since he is new to the case, he could not comment on the actual patentability of the claims, since a further update search and consideration would be required.